

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Research and Reviews in Physics</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJR2P_120251</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Quasars and Expansion of the Space-time</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>I like your article because your lyrical narrative allows a fluid and understandable capture of ideas for the reader. One area of opportunity that is very interesting is the recent discovery of the James Webb telescope with the Hubble tension. Perhaps you could achieve something more innovative if you include these new concepts discovered by Dr. Riess' team, but with respect to your proposed work.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is appropriate, but you could be a little more specific and mention in the title the two classes of quasars that are used in your project.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is correct; I suggest adding the reference used for your regression method. Perhaps you could briefly include why the medium is involved or not in the reported behaviour of quasars. It could also be added that this work does not consider the Hubble tension.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>I think the sections and structure of the document are adequate, but I think that the graphics could be done with a higher quality. For my taste it is necessary to add the references specifically at least by paragraph, it would be excellent that by idea. In the introduction, the quintessence should be explained in a few more lines, although I understand that it might go beyond the focus of the manuscript. Also, you must be more specific with the references of each graph or figure and not just put that belong to the authors.</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>I think the manuscript is scientifically correct but to say that it is robust depends on the grade you want to submit. In my opinion, if he's going to be submitted for a PhD, I think it needs to innovate more than what I already mentioned about the Hubble tension and the more genuine work like that of Dr. Riess' team. One paragraph could explain why if the density of black energy is kept constant its contribution to the expansion of the universe increases. To increase scientific strength, it might be useful to use much more modern references.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. =</p>	<p>To increase scientific strength, it might be useful to use much more current references. I didn't see any from this year or the previous one, and the impact and degree of innovation might depend on that. It seems to me that the state of the art could have been more thoroughly reviewed.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of English is good, as I mentioned, it allows a smooth reading.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Well done! You have areas of opportunity; you must go ahead with a lot of courage. Keep Going.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Aura Jazmine Vega Alcántar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México</b>